



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*BCL*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/876,008	06/13/97	SUTCLIFFE	17778-19

RONALD E CAHILL  
NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH  
ONE INTERNATIONAL PLACE  
BOSTON MA 02110-2699

LM01/0706

EXAMINER
KINDRED, A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2771	<i>13</i>

DATE MAILED: 07/06/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/876,008

Applicant(s)

Sutcliffe et al.

Examiner

Kindred

Group Art Unit

2771

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4-17-00

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2771

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment B, filed on 4/17/00.
2. Claims 1-34 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 16, 21, 29 and 32 are independent claims.
3. The present title of the application is "Method and apparatus for providing a personal page."
4. The rejection of claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Wesinger, Jr. et al., in view of DuFresne and further in view of Liu et al., has been withdrawn as necessitated by the Amendment.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 2771

6. Claims 1, 9-10, 16, 21, 29, 32, and 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sudai et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,950,200, in view of Wesinger, Jr. et al., 55,778,367.

With respect to independent claim 1, Sudai et al. discloses “prompting a page-creating remote user with a plurality of page templates for the personal page and receiving a template selection from the remote user” (“the user may also be prompted to enter a password . . . he or she is allowed to enter new objects . . . to enter the user Ids of one or more object . . .”--column 4, line 64) “storing attributes representing each selection or entry made by the page-creating remote user in one or more databases” (“a registration procedure, he or she is able to enter new objects in to the database in the future or modify a previous selection . . .”--column 4, line 33) “providing the page-creating remote user with means to input security parameters for the personal page, the security parameters specifying authorization of at least one other remote user to access the personal page” (“a user ID social security number, drivers license number . . . a user ID can also be any of the above, with a geographic identifier . . .”--column 4, line 53) “prompting the page-creating remote user to select or enter graphical information to display on the personal page and receiving the selection or entry from the remote user” (“the geographical identifier can be considered a part of the user ID . . .”--column 4, line 57) “displaying the personal page upon request to page-viewing remote users who are authorized to access the personal page” (“if a first person’s feelings or interests are not mirrored by a second person, the system will not notify either person and only the computer system will be aware of the first person’s feelings . . .”--abstract).

Art Unit: 2771

Sudai et al. does not teach “storing the security parameters in one or more databases.”

Wesinger, Jr. et al. discloses “storing the security parameters in one or more databases” (“input is accepted from the individual users . . . stored in the database . . .”--column 2, line 63). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of Wesinger “storing the security parameters in one or more databases” (“input is accepted from the individual users . . . stored in the database . . .”--column 2, line 63) with the teachings of Sudai above, because using the steps of “storing the security parameters in one or more databases” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to store users passwords, IDs, etc. in databases for future retrieval and manipulation.

With respect to dependent claim 9, Sudai et al. does not disclose “wherein only graphics having a smaller storage size than a predetermined storage size may be entered by a user.”

Wesinger, Jr. et al. discloses “wherein only graphics having a smaller storage size than a predetermined storage size may be entered by a user” (“wherein the user classifications include textual and graphical user classifications”--column 14, line 64). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of Sudai “wherein only graphics having a smaller storage size than a predetermined storage size may be entered by a user” (“wherein the user classifications include textual and graphical user classifications”--column 14, line 64) with the teachings of Wesinger above because using the steps of “wherein only graphics having a smaller storage size than a predetermined storage size may be entered by a user”, would have given those skilled in the art the ability to select graphics based on

Art Unit: 2771

a predetermined size. This gives authors of web pages a way of maintaining consistency when processing graphics and limit users from entering oversized graphic information..

With respect to independent claims 10, 16, 21, 29 and 32, these claims are rejected on ground corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1 and 9 and are similarly rejected.

With respect to dependent claims 23 and 24-25, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected independent claim 1 and are similarly rejected.

With respect to dependent claims 26-28, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected independent claim 1 and dependent claim 25 and are similarly rejected.

7. Claims 2-8, 11-15, 17-20, 22, 30-31 and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sudai et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,950,200, in view of Wesinger, Jr. et al., 55,778,367, and further in view of DuFresne, U.S. Patent Number 5,835,712.

With respect to dependent claim 2, Sudai et al. does not disclose "wherein each page template is stored as a plurality of rows in one or more databases on the computer system."

DuFresne discloses "wherein each page template is stored as a plurality of rows in one or more databases on the computer system" ("each template also includes an identification field for entering the template . . . the template and content databases . . ."--column 4, line). It would have

Art Unit: 2771

been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of DuFresne “wherein each page template is stored as a plurality of rows in one or more databases on the computer system” (“each template also includes an identification field for entering the template . . . the template and content databases . . .”--column 4, line) with the teachings of Sudai above, because using the step of “wherein each page template is stored as a plurality of rows in one or more databases on the computer system”, allow those skilled in the art to be able to use and store page templates relating to data in a database.

With respect to dependent claim 3, Sudai et al. does not disclose “wherein at least one row for each page template provides the overall layout of the personal page.” DuFresne discloses “wherein at least one row for each page template provides the overall layout of the personal page” (“each template specifies what information from the database a corresponding output Web page should contain and how the page should look . . .”--column 9, line 51). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of DuFresne “wherein at least one row for each page template provides the overall layout of the personal page” (“each template specifies what information from the database a corresponding output Web page should contain and how the page should look . . .”--column 9, line 51) with the teachings of Sudai above, because using the steps of “wherein at least one row for each page template provides the overall layout of the personal page” would have given those skilled in the art the advantage of producing structured information of pages in a networking environment.

Art Unit: 2771

With respect to dependent claim 4, Saudi et al. discloses “wherein at least one row for each page template corresponds to a field in the page template for receiving a remote user selection or entry” (“entries from the users containing the information to be electronically publisher . . .”--abstract).

With respect to dependent claim 5, Sudai et al. does not disclose “wherein the attributes stored in one or more databases are each stored in a row corresponding to a field in the page template.” DuFresne discloses “wherein the attributes stored in one or more databases are each stored in a row corresponding to a field in the page template” (“each item in a template, such as the ID field 91 and access control fields 92 . . . item in a template and the ‘value’ is the corresponding data record held by that field . . .”--column 9, line 55). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of DuFresne “wherein the attributes stored in one or more databases are each stored in a row corresponding to a field in the page template” (“each item in a template, such as the ID field 91 and access control fields 92 . . . item in a template and the ‘value’ is the corresponding data record held by that field . . .”--column 9, line 55) with the teachings of Wesinger above, because using the steps of “wherein the attributes stored in one or more databases are each stored in a row corresponding to a field in the page template”, would have given those skilled in the art the tools to correlate data attributes in a database with templates data in an networking environment.

With respect to dependent claim 6, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected independent claim 1 and is similarly rejected.



Art Unit: 2771

With respect to dependent claim 7, Sudai et al. discloses “wherein the row corresponding to the overall layout of the page template includes HTML code describing the page template layout” (“this form can be implemented using HTML . . .”--column 5, line 21).

With respect to dependent claim 8, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-7. In dependent claim 8, Applicant claims a method which contains steps corresponding to the method of rejected independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-7.

With respect to dependent claims 11-15, 17-20 and 22, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected dependent claims 2-8 and are similarly rejected

With respect to dependent claims 30-31 and 33-34, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected dependent claim 6 and are similarly rejected.

Art Unit: 2771

**Conclusion**

8. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703)-308-9051 (**formal** communications intended for entry),

Or:

(703)-308-5403 (**informal** communications labeled **PROPOSED** or **DRAFT**).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Sixth Floor Receptionist, Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to


Alford Kindred, whose telephone number is (703)-305-3802 and can normally be reached

Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu, can be reached at (703)-305-4393.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-305-3900.

AWK

  
HOSAIN T. ALAM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER